chair John Chiang member Judy Chu, Ph.D. member Michael C. Genest

State of California
Franchise Tax Board

February 2008 Franchise Tax Board Public Litigation Roster

All currently active cases and those recently closed are listed on the roster. Activity or changes with respect to a case appear in bold-face type. Any new cases will appear in bold-face type.

A list of new cases that have been added to the roster for the month is also provided, as well as a list of cases that have been closed and will be dropped from the next report.

The Franchise Tax Board posts the Litigation Roster on its Internet site. The Litigation Roster can be found at: http://www.ftb.ca.gov/law/litrstr/index.html.

The Litigation Rosters for the last four years may be found on the Internet site.

FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX Closed Cases – February 2008

<u>Case Name</u> <u>Court Number</u>

NONE

FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX New Cases – February 2008

<u>Case Name</u> <u>Court Number</u>

Banister, Joseph R. Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS04091

Mickelsen, Paul L. & Patricia A. Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC385197

FRANCHISE AND INCOME TAX MONTHLY REFUND LITIGATION ROSTER

February 2007

ABBOTT LABORATORIES & Affiliates v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC369808 Filed – 04/20/07

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate Dist. No. B204210

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
J. Pat Powers

FTB's Counsel
Brian Wesley

Baker & McKenzie, LLP

Issue: Whether Plaintiffs were entitled to a deduction under section 24402 after the statute was found to be

unconstitutional.

Years: 1999-2000 Amount \$715,735.00

Status: Plaintiffs' Notice of Appeal filed on December 7, 2007.

APPLE, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. 08471129 Filed – 01/16/08

Taxpayer's Counsel

*FTB's Counsel**

Jeffrey M. Vesely Kristian Whitten

Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw, Pittman, LLP

Issues: 1. Whether the Franchise Tax Board properly determined the order in which dividends are paid from

earnings and profits.

2. Whether the Franchise Tax Board improperly allocated and disallowed interest.

Year: 09/30/89 Amount \$231,038.00

Status: Notice of Acknowledgment sent to Plaintiff on February 15, 2008.

BAKERSFIELD MALL, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. No. CGC07462728 Filed – 04/25/07

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District No. A119709

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin

Marguerite Stricklin

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the LLC fee imposed on an LLC doing business entirely within California by Rev. Tax. Code §17942 is unconstitutional under the due process, equal protection and commerce clauses of the U.S. Constitution.

2. Whether Rev. Tax. Code §17942 violates Article XIII, section 26 of the California Constitution.

3. Whether Rev. Tax. Code §17942 constitutes an invalid exercise of the states police power and is void.

Years: 2000 through 2004 \$56,537.00 Amount

Status: Case Management Conference held and continued/bifurcated Court Trial set for April 3, 2008.

BANISTER, JOSEPH R. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court No. 06CS00930

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS04091

Taxpayer's Counsel

Joseph R. Banister (Pro Per)

Filed - 07/10/06Transferred - 09/14/07FTB's Counsel

Amy Winn

1. Whether plaintiff has a California filing obligation.

2. Whether penalties were properly assessed against plaintiff.

Year: 2002 \$895.00 Tax Amount

\$537.50 Penalty

Status: No. 96CS00930:

First Amended Petition for Writ of Mandate filed on October 4, 2006. Defendant Franchise Tax Board and State Board of Equalization's Joint Demurrer to First Amended Petition for Writ of Mandate filed on November 1, 2006. Ruling on Demurrer filed on April 18, 2007; Respondent's Demurrer is overruled in part and sustained in part without leave to amend. Order filed on September 4, 2007; Court determined that the case is not a mandate proceeding, but as a civil action for a refund of taxes under Revenue and Taxation Code section 19382.

Docket No. 07AS04091:

Defendant's Case Management Statement filed on November 27, 2007. Notice of Motion and Motion of Defendant to Strike Demand for Jury Trial filed on February 19, 2008.

BAYER CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS03350

Taxpayer's Counsel

Eric J. Coffill, Carley A. Roberts

Morrison & Foerster, LLP

Filed - 07/23/07FTB's Counsel

Steven J. Green

Whether the value of Plaintiff's inventory was properly calculated for each of the years for purposes of Issue:

determining its cost of goods sold.

Years: 1993-1994 \$2,481,551.00 Amount

Status: Case Management Conference held on February 21, 2008.

BRAR, KALDEEP S. & IMELDA A. & PROFESSIONAL RESOURCE ENTERPRISES, INC. v.

Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC365233

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> Robert F Klueger, Esq.

Boldra, Klueger & Stein, LLP

Filed – 01/24/07

<u>FTB's Counsel</u> Mark P. Richelson

<u>Issue</u>: 1. Whether FTB properly determined the Los Angeles Revitalization Zone credit carryovers to which

Plaintiffs were entitled.

Year: 1999 Amount \$335,885.53

Status: Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment granted on January 23, 2008.

BRATTON, KERRY M. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07461671

Taxpayer's Counsel
Thomas F. Carlucci

Foley & Lardner, LLP

Filed – 03/23/07

FTB's Counsel
Amy J. Winn

FTB's Counsel

Donald R. Currier

<u>Issue</u>: Whether the penalty for the promotion of an abusive tax shelter provided for in section 19177 was properly assessed to Plaintiff.

<u>Year</u>: 2003 <u>Amount</u> \$3,996,235.94 Penalty

Status: Trial rescheduled to March 26, 2008.

CITY NATIONAL CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC334772 Filed – 06/10/05

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District No. B189240

California Supreme Court No. S150563

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Kenneth R. Chiate, Mary S. Thomas

Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart, Oliver & Hedges, LLP

Sherrill Johnson

Offices of the General Counsel

City National Bank

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiff improperly engaged in tax shelter transaction involving Regulated Investment Trusts (REITs) and Regulated Investment Companies (RICs) during the subject years.

- 2. Whether certain subsidiaries were exempt from California taxation as IRC 501(c)(15) entities.
- 3. Whether Plaintiff has satisfied the requirement of exhausting all administrative remedies in order to maintain a lawsuit.

<u>Years</u>: 1999 through 2003 <u>Amount</u> \$84,676,129.00

Status: Case Management Conference continued to June 6, 2008.

CITY NATIONAL CORPORATION & Subs. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 06AS02275

Taxpayer's Counsel

Kenneth R. Chiate

Quinn, Emanuel, Urquhart Oliver & Hedges, LLP

Filed – 06/06/06 <u>FTB's Counsel</u> **Molly K. Mosley**

Sherrill Johnson

Offices of the General Counsel

City National Bank

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Plaintiffs improperly engaged in tax shelter transaction involving Real Estate Investment Trusts

(REITs).

Year: 2004 Amount \$23,900,000.00

Status: Discovery proceeding. Trial Setting Conference scheduled for June 2, 2008.

COLGATE-PALMOLIVE, CO. & SUBSIDIARIES v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 03AS00707

Taxpayer's Counsel

Eric J. Coffill, Carley A. Roberts

Morrison & Foerster, LLP

Filed - 02/07/03

FTB's Counsel
Steven J. Green

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the sales factor was properly calculated by excluding proceeds from short-term financial instruments and value added taxes assessed by foreign countries.

2. Whether the property factor needs to be adjusted to value property at its appreciated value to fairly reflect its activities in California.

<u>Years</u>: 1974 through 1982, 1984 through 1987, 1989 through 1991 <u>Amount</u> \$2,912,696.00

Status: Trial continued to October 25, 2009.

DELUCCHI, MARIO & KATHLEEN, et al. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 06AS02661 Filed – 06/22/06

Court of Appeal, 3rd Appellate District No. C056503

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselHarry Gordon Oliver IIGeorge Spanos

Attorney at Law

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiffs properly computed income on an installment sale.

- 2. Whether Plaintiffs may be deemed to have elected out of the installment method.
- 3. Whether Plaintiffs' gain on the sale of a stock qualified for exemption as Small Business Stock in 1995.

<u>Year</u>: 1995 <u>Amount</u> \$954,800.00

Status: Plaintiffs' Opening Brief filed on January 30, 2008.

DELUXE CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07462305 Filed – 04/11/07

Taxpayer's Counsel

*FTB's Counsel**

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin

Karen Yiu

Silverstein & Pomerantz

Issues: 1. Whether the Franchise Tax Board has the authority to review the validity of enterprise zone credit

vouchers issued by an enterprise zone.

2. Whether the Franchise Tax Board properly disallowed enterprise zone credits claimed by plaintiff.

<u>Years</u>: 1999 through 2001 <u>Amount</u> \$979,741.00

Status: Order continuing Mandatory Settlement Conference continued to July 1, 2008, Trial continued to

July 14, 2008. Discovery proceeding.

DICON FIBEROPTICS, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC367885 Filed – 03/13/07

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District No. B202997

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselThomas R. Freeman, Paul S. Chan,Mark Richelson

Bird, Marella, Boxer, Wolpert,

Nessim, Drooks & Lincenberg, P.C.

Marty Dakessian

Mardiros, Hagop, Dakessian

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Franchise Tax Board properly denied EZ Credits claimed by Plaintiff.

Year: Ending 03/31/07 Amount \$1,104,992.00

Status: Defendant/Respondent's Extension to File Opening Brief to March 14, 2008, filed on

February 14, 2008.

DUFFIELD, DAVID A. & CHERYL D. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07459331 Filed – 01/05/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Jeffrey M. Vesely

David Lew

Kerne H. O. Matsubara, Annie H. Huang

Pillsbury, Winthrop, Shaw, Pittman, LLP

- 1. Whether Plaintiffs exchange of PeopleSoft Stock for the stock of Nevada Pacific Development Corporation qualified as a tax-free exchange pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section
- 2. Whether Plaintiffs were subject to the penalty imposed by section 19777.5.
- 3. Whether the penalty imposed by section 19777.5 meets Due Process requirements.

4. Whether Plaintiffs were entitled to an abatement of interest pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code section 19104.

1994 Year:

Amount \$7,152,029.00 Tax

\$4,006,972.25 Penalty

Status: Discovery proceeding. Order continuing Settlement Conference to April 1, 2008, and Trial continued to April 14, 2008.

ELS EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS0307 Filed - 07/05/07Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel Robert R. Rubin Robert Asperger

McDonough, Holland & Allen, PC

Whether Plaintiff was entitled for California purposes, to elect out of treatment provided by Issue:

section 338(h)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code.

08/28/97 \$630,615.97 Year: Amount

Status: Trial Setting Conference scheduled for June 16, 2008. Discovery proceeding.

FREIDBERG, EDWARD AND TRACI REYNOLDS v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS02358 Filed - 02/02/07Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel Edward Freidberg, Suzanne M. Alves Amy Winn Freidberg & Parker Larry Keethe

Whether Franchise Tax Board was required to credit the amount of a non-final judgment to satisfy Issue:

Plaintiffs' self-assessed taxes for years subsequent to those involved in the judgment.

Years: 2003 and 2004 Amount \$9,326.32 Penalty

Status: Trial scheduled for March 10, 2008. **Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings denied**

and Plaintiff's Request for Judicial Notice denied on February 4, 2008.

GARCIA, W. ROCKE AND GLENDA L. v. Franchise Tax Board

Filed - 10/02/06 San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC06456659 Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel Kristian Whitten William J. McLean

A Professional Law Corporation

<u>Issue</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiffs timely acquired replacement real property in compliance with the Internal Revenue Code section 1033.

2. Whether a decision by the State Board of Equalization precludes the assessment of penalties pursuant to section 19777.5.

3. Whether the penalty assessed by Section 19777.5 satisfies due process requirements.

<u>Year</u>: 1992 <u>Amount</u> \$357,009.00 Tax

\$259,056.00 Penalty

Status: Tentative Decision filed on January 24, 2008, in favor of Plaintiff.

GENERAL MILLS, INC. & SUBSIDIARIES v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC05-439929 Filed – 03/29/05

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Dist. No. A120492

Taxpayer's Counsel
Thomas H. Steele
Joyce Hee

Andres Vallejo, Jeffrey S. Terraciano

Morrison & Foerster LLP

Paul H. Frankel

Morrison & Foerster LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether the Plaintiffs' payroll factor was properly computed by excluding foreign employee stock options.

- 2. Whether the Plaintiffs' sales factor was properly calculated by excluding receipts from commodities transactions and short-term financial instruments.
- 3. Whether federal RAR adjustments were properly taken into account.

Years: 1992 through 1997 Amount \$3,950,026.00

Status: Plaintiffs/Appellants' Pro Hac Vice Application granted on February 15, 2008, Paul H. Frankel is admitted as counsel.

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION, et al. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC269404 Filed - 03/06/02

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District No. B165665

California Supreme Court No. S127086

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselCharles R. AjalatStephen LewLaw Office of Ajalat, Polley & AyoobDonald Currier

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether gross receipts from the disposition of marketable securities were properly excluded from the sales factor.

2. Whether interest income was properly characterized as business income.

- 3. Whether dividends received with respect to stock representing less than a 50% voting interest were properly classified as business income.
- 4. Whether the limitation on deductions prescribed by sections 24402 and 24410 resulted in unconstitutional discriminatory taxation.
- 5. Whether various receipts from intangible assets were properly excluded from the sales factor.
- 6. Whether research tax credits were properly limited to the entity incurring the expense.
- 7. Whether a deduction was properly denied with respect to foreign country taxes withheld on dividends.
- 8. Whether the taxpayer is entitled to an increased deduction with respect to depreciation on assets held by foreign country subsidiaries.
- 9. Whether the taxes determined to be owing by the Franchise Tax Board were properly computed and assessed.

Years: 1986 through 1988 Amount \$10,692,755.00

<u>Status</u>: Discovery Proceeding. Final Status Conference scheduled for September 29, 2008. Trial scheduled for October 1, 2008.

GOLDEN WEST HEALTH PLAN, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC353849 Filed – 06/15/06

Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate Court Dist. No. B205246

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselAlan R. MalerMarla Markman

Greenberg Traurig, LLP

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Plaintiff made a valid S Corporation election for California purposes.

<u>Years</u>: 04/01/03 through 06/01/03 Amount \$669,045.00

<u>Status</u>: Defendant's Notice of Appeal filed on January 28, 2008.

GONZALES, THOMAS J. II v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC06454297 Filed - 07/18/06

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Martin A. Schainbaum, Esq. Jeffrey Rich

Martin A. Schainbaum, PLC

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether a \$142,000,000.00 capital loss from an abusive tax shelter is allowable.

- 2. Whether a taxpayer self-reporting under VCI is eligible for interest suspension pursuant to section 19116.
- 3. Whether the taxpayer is entitled to deduct legal expenses paid in connection with an investment.

<u>Years</u>: 2000 and 2001 <u>Amount</u> \$12,374,510.00

Status: Discovery proceeding. Trial rescheduled to August 18, 2008.

HANGER, DWIGHT T. & VICKI J. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC382988 Filed – 12/28/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Gordon B. Cutler, Esq. Filed – 12/28/07

Anthony Sgherzi

<u>Issue</u>: Whether taxpayers constructively received the proceeds from the exchange of LLC memberships for

stock in the taxable year.

Year: 2000 Amount \$324,908.00

Status: Summons and Complaint served on the Franchise Tax Board on January 23, 2008. Case Management

Conference scheduled for April 28, 2008.

HYATT, GILBERT P. v. Franchise Tax Board

Clark County Nevada District Court No. A382999 Filed - 01/06/98

Nevada Supreme Court No. 47141

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> <u>FTB's Counsel</u>

Thomas L. Steffen & Mark A. Hutchison

Hutchison & Steffen, H. Bartow Farr III

James W. Bradshaw

McDonald, Carano,

Wilson LLP

Las Vegas, Nevada

Issues: 1. Whether Plaintiff was a resident of California from September 26, 1991 through April 2, 1992.

2. Whether the Franchise Tax Board committed various torts with respect to plaintiff and is subject to a claim for damages.

3. Whether the Nevada courts have or should exercise jurisdiction over the Franchise Tax Board.

<u>Years</u>: 1991 and 1992 <u>Amount</u> \$7,545,492.00 Tax

\$5,659,119.00 Penalty

Status: Clark County Nevada District Court

Trial scheduled for April 14, 2008.

JURIKA, WILLIAM & MICHELLE, et al. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07466483 Filed – 08/22/07

Taxpayer's Counsel

Filed – 08/22/07

FTB's Counsel

Arthur V. Pearson Joyce Hee

Murphy, Pearson, Bradley & Feeney

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiffs' claims for refund were barred by the statute of limitation.

2. Are Plaintiffs entitled to equitable relief from the statute of limitation.

<u>Year</u>: 2000 <u>Amount</u> \$914,777.00

Status: Settlement Conference rescheduled to August 26, 2008, Trial scheduled for September 8, 2008.

KANCHANAPOOM, VISUT & MEECHI v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. NC050569 Filed – 12/04/07

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselKenneth J. CatanzariteRon Ito

Richard Vergel de Dios Catanzarite Law Corporation

Issue: 1. Whether passive activity and capital losses from the disposition of partnership interests are

deductible in the taxable years in issue.

Years: 1991 through 1995 Amount \$230,632.00

Status: Defendant's Demurrer filed on February 25, 2008. Case Management Conference scheduled for

April 9, 2008.

MANNING, LAWRENCE T. & JOY v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC382987 Filed -12/28/07<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Gordon B. Cutler, Esq. Filed -12/28/07Anthony Sgherzi

Issue: Whether taxpayers constructively received the proceeds from the exchange of LLC memberships for

stock in the taxable year.

Year: 2000 Amount \$167,710.00

Status: Summons and Complaint served on January 23, 2008. Case Management Conference scheduled for

April 28, 2008.

MERCURY GENERAL CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. No. CGC07462688 Filed – 04/25/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Roy E. Crawford, Roburt J. Waldow Julian Standen

McDermott, Will & Emery

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether a portion of Plaintiff's insurance subsidiary management expenses was properly disallowed under Rev. & Tax. Code § 24425.

2. Whether the amnesty penalty under Rev. & Tax. Code § 19777.5 violates the due process clause of the U.S. Constitution, applies only retroactively, or attaches only after a liability becomes due and payable.

Years: 12/31/93 through 12/31/96 Amount \$7,585,601.28

Status: Discovery proceeding. Hearing on Motion to Strike Portion of Complaint scheduled for

March 27, 2008. Mandatory Settlement Conference continued to April 4, 2008. Trial continued

to April 28, 2008.

MICKELSEN, PAUL L. & PATRICIA A. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC385197

Taxpayer's Counsel

Charles P. Rettig, Esq.

Steven Toscher, Sharyn M. Fisk

Hochman, Salkin, Retigg, Toscher & Perez, P.C.

Issue: Whether a taxpayer self-reporting under VCI is eligible for interest suspension pursuant to

Filed - 02/08/08

FTB's Counsel

Donald R. Currier

section 19116.

<u>Year</u>: 1999 <u>Amount</u> \$537,178.00 Interest

Status: Summons and Complaint filed on February 8, 2008, and served on February 27, 2008.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC08471260 Filed - 01/22/08<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

James P. Kleier, Brian W. Toman

Reed Smith, LLP

Joyce Hee

Lucy Wang

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether royalty income received from licensing agreements with Original Equipment Manufacturers should be sourced outside of California based upon costs of performance.

- 2. Whether receipts from trading marketable securities should be included in the sales factor.
- 3. Whether the value of trademarks, copyrights, patents and other intangible assets should be included in the property factor.
- 4. Whether the taxpayer should be allowed a deduction under Revenue and Taxation Code section 24402 for dividends received for the years at issue.

<u>Years</u>: 1995 and 1996 Amount \$25,283,868.00

Status: Plaintiff's granted Defendant an Extension to March 7, 2008, to file Answer to Complaint.

MIKE, ANGELINA v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. 37-2007-00067324-CU-MC-CTL Filed – 05/25/07

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u> <u>FTB's Counsel</u>

Richard M. Freeman, Carole M Ross

Leslie Branman Smith

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, LLP

<u>Issue</u>: Whether plaintiff's distribution of gaming income derived from revenue generated on a Native

American reservation is exempted from California tax because plaintiff resided on the reservation of

another tribe.

Year: 2000 Amount \$31,856.00

Status: Trial scheduled for September 19, 2008.

MONTGOMERY WARD LLC v. Franchise Tax Board v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. GIC802767

Filed - 12/30/02

Taxpayer's Counsel

Edwin P. Antolin, Amy Silverstein

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

Domini Pham

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether proceeds from the sale, maturity or other disposition of short-term financial instruments were properly excluded from the sales factor.

2. Whether section 24402 Rev. & Tax. Code is constitutional.

<u>Years</u>: 1989 through 1994 <u>Amount</u> \$2,694,192.00

Status: Notice of Entry of Judgment for Plaintiff filed on January 15, 2008.

NEW GAMING SYSTEMS, INC. & AKA INDUSTRIES, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 03AS05705 Filed - 10/10/03

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

Robert R. Rubin FTB's Counsel

Amy Winn

McDonough, Holland & Allen, PC

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether New Gaming Systems, Inc., timely filed its suit for refund for the income year ended March 31, 1996.

- 2. Whether a declaratory relief action can be brought to prevent the collection of tax.
- 3. Whether a suit for refund can be maintained for a year in which the amount of tax has not been paid in full.
- 4. Whether Plaintiffs are liable for California taxes on income generated from leases for operating Indian casinos.

Years: 1996 and 1997 Amount \$111,587.87

Status: Trial set for July 23, 2007 postponed, date unknown.

NISSAN NORTH AMERICA, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC373781

Filed – 07/06/07

Taxpayer's Counsel

Richard J. Ayoob

Ajalat, Polley, Ayoob & Matarese

Ronald N. Ito

Donald R. Currier

Issues: 1. Whether claimed EZ credits were erroneously disallowed.

- 2. Whether Value Added Taxes should be included in the denominator of the sales factor.
- 3. Whether other errors were made in computing the taxpayer's tax.

<u>Years</u>: 04/01/01 through 03/31/02 <u>Amount</u> \$725.632.00

Status: Case Management Conference continued to March 5, 2008.

NORTHWEST ENERGETIC SERVICES, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No.CGC05-437721 Filed – 01/15/05

Court of Appeal 1st Appellate Court Dist. No. A114805

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Court Dist. No. A115841 (Attorneys' Fees)

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Court Dist. No. A115950 (Attorneys' Fees)

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin Marguerite C. Stricklin

Silverstein & Pomerantz

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Revenue and Taxation Code section 17942, which imposes a tax upon the "total income from

all sources reportable to this state" of LLC registered with the Secretary of State, violates the Due

Process Clause and Commerce Clauses.

<u>Years</u>: 12/31/97 through 12/31/01 <u>Amount</u> \$25,067.00 Fees

\$ 3,764.29 Penalty

Status: Plaintiff/Respondent's Petition for Rehearing filed on February 14, 2008. Defendant/Appellant's

Opposition to Petition for Rehearing filed on February 27, 2008.

RIVER GARDEN RETIREMENT HOME v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. CGC07467783 Filed – 10/02/07

Taxpayer's CounselFTB's CounselAmy L. Silverstein, Edwin AntolinDavid Lew

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

<u>Issues</u>: 1. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to a dividend received deduction under Revenue and Taxation Code section 24402 for the years in issue.

2. Whether the penalty imposed by Revenue and Taxation Code section 19777.5 was properly assessed.

<u>Years</u>: 1999 and 2000 <u>Amount</u> \$5,375.26 Tax

\$ 895.93 Penalty

Status: Demurrer Sustained Without Leave to Amend filed on February 8, 2008, as to the First Cause of

Action, Second Cause of Action is overruled. Plaintiff's Objection to Exhibits B and C of

Defendant's Request for Judicial Notice is granted.

ROHR, INC. v. Franchise Tax Board

San Diego Superior Court Docket No. 37-2007-00070925-CU-CO-CTL Filed – 09/07/07

Court of Appeal, 4th Dist., Div. 1 No. D052309

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Mark L. Mann

<u>FTB's Counsel</u>
Brian D. Wesley

Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps LLP

Issues: 1. Whether Rohr, Inc. was engaged in a unitary business with Rohr Credit Corporation, its subsidiary.

2. Whether losses incurred by Rohr Credit Corporation constituted nonbusiness income.

3. Whether plaintiff is entitled to attorneys' fees.

4. Whether a suit for refund can be maintained where not all the interest due has been paid.

<u>Years</u>: 07/31/85 through 07/31/87 <u>Amount</u> \$5,155,415.00

Status: Petition for Writ of Mandate denied. Request for Stay issued January 14, 2008, vacated on

February 14, 2008.

SCHENCK, WILLIAM E & KARREN v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 07AS04188 Filed - 09/14/07 <u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Alvin R. Wohl **FIB's Counsel Molly Mosley**

Palmer, Kazanjian, Wohl, Perkins, LLP

Issues: 1. Whether Defendant correctly calculated the gain realized on the sale of property.

2. Whether Defendant correctly asserted a penalty for failure to provide information.

3. Whether Defendant properly assessed a penalty pursuant to Section 19777.5.

4. Whether the taxpayers effectively elected installment sale treatment.

<u>Year</u>: 1999 <u>Amount</u> \$600,169.00 Tax

\$150,042.25 Penalty

Status: Discovery proceeding.

SHAW, BRIAN K. v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC378829Filed -10/10/07 $\underline{Taxpayer's Counsel}$ $\underline{FTB's Counsel}$ David Roth, Esq.Diane Spencer-Shaw

Hochman, Salkin, Rettig, Toscher & Perez

Issues: 1. Whether Plaintiff was a resident of California for tax purposes.

2. Whether assessing a penalty under Revenue and Taxation Code section 19777.5 violates Due Process.

<u>Years</u>: 1990 through 1994 <u>Amount</u> \$487,084.00 Tax

\$ 89,534.00 Penalty

Status: Trial Setting Conference scheduled for July 31, 2008.

SHIMMON, EDWARD & ANNELIESE v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC363822

<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>
Charles P. Rettig, Sharyn M. Fisk
Hochman, Salkin, Rettig, Toscher & Perez, P.C.

Filed – 12/22/06

<u>FTB's Counsel</u>
Lisa W. Chao
Donald Currier

Whether a taxpayer filing under the first option of VCI was eligible for the interest suspension Issue:

provided by section 19116.

1999 Year: \$515,422.00 Interest Amount

Status: Order, Court Stay of Proceedings until June 12, 2008, pending State Board of Equalization's decisions

in the VCI cases.

THODE, JEROME P. & KATHLEEN A. THODE-FERRIS v. Franchise Tax Board

Los Angeles Superior Court Docket No. BC383969 Filed - 01/17/08<u>Taxpayer's Counsel</u>

FTB's Counsel Gordon B. Cutler, Esq. Anthony Sgherzi

Whether taxpayers constructively received the proceeds from the exchange of LLC memberships for Issue:

stock in the taxable year.

2000 Year: Amount \$137,694.00

Status: Summons and Complaint served on the Franchise Tax Board on January 23, 2008. Case Management

Conference scheduled for April 23, 2008.

TOY'S "R" US, INC. & AFFILIATES v. Franchise Tax Board

Sacramento Superior Court Docket No. 01AS04316 Filed - 07/17/01

Court of Appeal, 4th Appellate Court No. C045386

California Supreme Court No. S143422

Taxpayer's Counsel FTB's Counsel Eric J. Coffill Steven J. Green

Carley A. Roberts

Morrison & Foerster, LLP

Issue: Whether gross receipts from the sale of short-term financial investment were properly excluded from

the documentation of the sales factor.

<u>Years</u>: 1991 through 1994 Amount \$5,342,117.00

Status: Case is transferred to the Court of Appeal on November 15, 2006, with directions to vacate its decision

and to reconsider the cause of action in light of Microsoft v. Franchise Tax Board (2006) 39 Cal.4th 750 and General Motors v. Franchise Tax Board (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 773. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 29.3(d).)

VENTAS FINANCE I, LLC v. Franchise Tax Board

San Francisco Superior Court Docket No. 05-440001

Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Court No. A116277 & A117751

Taxpayer's Counsel

Amy L. Silverstein, Edwin Antolin

Silverstein & Pomerantz, LLP

Filed – 04/01/05

FTB's Counsel

Marguerite Stricklin

<u>Issue</u>: Whether Revenue and Taxation Code section 17942, which imposes a tax based upon the "total income

from all sources reportable to this state" of LLC registered with the Secretary of State, violates the Due

Process Clause and Commerce Clause.

<u>Years</u>: 2001 through 2003

<u>Amount</u> \$29,580.00

Status: Appellant/Defendant FTB's Opposition to Motion to Strike New Argument in

Appellant/Defendant FTB's Reply Brief, Reply to Plaintiff/Respondent Ventas' Opposition to Appellant/Defendant FTB's Request for Judicial Notice filed on February 13, 2008. Court issued

an order on February 26, 2008, deferring the Request for Judicial Notice and the Motion to

Strike until the Court rules on the merits of the case.